

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 14-23, 25 and 26 remain in the application. Claims 14-23, 25 and 26 are subject to examination. Claims 14 and 23 have been amended.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 7 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 14-18, 20, 22-23 and 25-26 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0203589 to Wang et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 14 and 23 have been amended to better define the invention. Support for the changes can be found by referring to paragraphs 5 and 36 of the published application.

Claims 14 and 23 now more clearly specify that a specific set of useful information is assigned to each user identity and each user identity is allocated with an **application** of the (transmitting) communication unit.

Before discussing the prior art, applicants will discuss the claimed features with detailed references to portions of the published application that explain those features and that explain the advantages obtained therefrom. It is hoped that this will assist the Examiner in better understanding the invention.

Since one communication unit can have several user identities assigned to it, one or several filter instructions can be explicitly assigned to a specific user identity. Thus, one user identity is in each case assigned expediently to one application (This is explained at paragraph 0036 of the published application).

The inventive method advantageously controls and evaluates the message traffic of a communication unit. With the aid of one or several useful items of information of the respective communication unit, varying and individual decisive rules for controlling and evaluating can be considered for varying communication units (This is explained at paragraph 0004 of the published application).

Furthermore, the inventive method makes it possible to log the message traffic of an application of the respective communication unit advantageously. Since the logging is performed on an application basis, the logging can be made dependent upon the contents, thus the message data contained in the individual items of information. Thus, when logging, the amount of data of information with multimedial contents, such as, for example, video sequences or language recordings, can be registered as a data volume with costs and items of information with control information can be excluded from the logging (This is explained at paragraph 0005 of the published application).

Thus, corresponding to the object achieved with the present invention, the control and evaluation of the message traffic of a communication unit is

provided in a simple and efficient manner by a network unit within a mobile radio system (This is explained at paragraph 0002 of the published application).

Wang et al. disclose a white list and a black list, which are associated with a participant (See Fig. 3 and paragraphs 0026-0028, 0032 and 0019 of Wang et al.). Wang et al disclose logging junk emails on certain preconditions.

However, Wang et al. do not disclose logging individual applications of one and the same transmitting communication unit.

In view of the discussion provided above, Applicants believe it should be clear that the invention defined by claims 14 and 23 is not anticipated or suggested by Wang et al.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 13 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 19 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0203589 to Wang et al. in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0199095 to Bandini et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants believe the invention as defined by claim 19 would not have been suggested for the reasons given above with regard to claim 14 and the teaching in Wang et al.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 14 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 21 has been rejected as being obvious

over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0203589 to Wang et al. in view of U.S.
Publication No. 2004/0203432 to Patil et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants believe the invention as defined by claim 21 would not have been
suggested for the reasons given above with regard to claim 14 and the
teaching in Wang et al.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken
alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 14 or
23. Claims 14 and 23 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art.
The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all
are ultimately dependent on claim 14 or 23.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 14-23, 25 and
26 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable,
counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible,
patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within
a period of three months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of
\$1,270.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16
and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-
1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

November 21, 2011

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101